

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for further considering the amendments filed with Applicant's response dated August 10, 2007. The Examiner has indicated in the Final Action mailed October 30, 2007 that Applicant's arguments are not persuasive because "the hot list provided with the candidate destinations can be interpreted as a prompt through which the user can select to receive the destination information". The Examiner further states that "the hot list with user input is itself a prompt for receiving destination information". These statements are drawn from the Response to Arguments found on page 6 of the Final Action. The Examiner sets forth a similar rationale on page 2 of the Final Action in stating that "the hot list of candidate destinations from which the user may select is itself a prompt for receiving destination selection, therefore the prompt and hot list are provided simultaneously together".

Applicant strongly disagrees. A "hot list" cannot be construed as a prompt for receiving the destination from a user. A prompt is a field or other dialog box in which alphanumeric characters such as a phone number or email address can be entered using the keys of the device. In contrast, the hot list of candidate destinations is a list of names and phone numbers (or names and email addresses). These are not a prompt for receiving the destination from a user. In other words, a prompt for receiving the destination from a user is a field into which data can be typed. Data cannot be typed into the hot list. Thus, it cannot be said that the hot list is "a prompt for receiving the destination from a user".

Furthermore, it is an inconsistent construction of these patent claims to assert that the prompt and hot list are provided simultaneously together because the hot list can be construed in two different ways, one of which allegedly reads on a prompt. In other words, a proper claim construction requires that different terms ("prompt" and "hot list") be construed differently. In other words, a proper construction of this claim requires that a prompt and a hot list be construed as different elements of the user interface. A hot list of candidate destinations is a list whereas a prompt is a field. It is therefore completely unfair for the Examiner to state that a hot list can be both a hot list and a prompt when it is clear from the claim language that these are separate and distinct aspects of the user interface.

In view of these arguments, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of the other independent claims are equally invalid and should also be withdrawn. With respect to the dependencies, since these add further limitations, these are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons advanced above. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that

this application is now in a condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests favourable reconsideration and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Bocking

By: /Matthew M. Roy/
Matthew M. Roy
Registration No. 48,074
Agent for Applicant

MMR/bm

Address: Ogilvy Renault
1981 McGill College Avenue
Suite 1600
Montreal, QC H3A 2Y3
Canada